



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,541	11/24/2003	Hung-Yang Chang	00280756AA	1270
30743	7590	10/04/2007	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			DAM, KIM LYNN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2179
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,541	CHANG ET AL. <i>m</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kim-Lynn Dam	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,11,14-19 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-7, 11, 14-19, and 21-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/14/07 has been entered.
2. Applicant amended claims 1, 11, 23 and 32; cancelled claims 2, 4, 8-10, 12-13, and 20; Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11, 14-19, and 21-32 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 23-26, and 29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inala et al. (USPN 6,442,590).

Regarding claim 23, Inala disclosed a system for collaborative Web browsing, comprising:

an augmented browser comprising an Internet browser, a collaboration toolbar, a collaboration explorer bar (Figure 2), a monitor, and a classifier provided with a miner

Art Unit: 2179

plug-in, the Internet browser populates with Web sites and notifies the monitor when new documents arrive, the monitor, in turn, attempts to classify the newly loaded content using the classifier, the classifier uses the content, URL (Universal Resource Locator) or meta data associated with the loaded page and passes this information to the miner plug-in in order to identify content to determine page, topic or meta data content, the monitor then attempts to discover related collaboration spaces (CollabSpaces), URL links, and role players that might be helpful to the loaded content in the Internet browser, once the monitor has completed classifying the content and collecting the related collaboration context, the monitor instructs the toolbar and the explorer bar to populate with corresponding collaborative elements that are related to a current browsing context (Column 9, lines 49-21, where other related collaboration spaces are discovered depending on classification such as subject, web page, size of session, types of products or services etc and “role players” are other clients); and a collaboration server component that maintains collaborative content and allows for the collaborative Web browser to interact with the collaboration content, the collaboration server including a view generator used to assemble together collaboration elements that are part of a collaboration context and a context manager communicating with the collaboration toolbar, monitor and view generator and which maintains relationships between collaboration elements and provides a mechanism to inference relationships between collaboration elements (Figure 2 shows an interactive interface where browser interacts with content (Column 8, lines 44-60) and elements infer relationships between elements (Column 8, line 61 to Column 9, line 48) (example:

when names appear and disappear from the collaboration space (Column 9, lines 40-48)).

Regarding claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration server component further includes a miner communicating with the miner plug-in of the augmented browser for more advanced mining (Column 9, lines 49-61).

Regarding claim 25, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration server component further includes a collaboration manager communicating with the collaboration explorer bar of the augmented browser and which provides a mechanism to interact with various collaboration modalities, including instant messaging, team rooms, and e-meetings (Column 8, line 61 to Column 9, line 14 ("control panel")).

Regarding claim 26, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration toolbar of the augmented browser hosts command buttons to retrieve, manage contextual collaboration spaces and command buttons for authentication and configuration (Figure 2, element 41 "control panel").

Regarding claim 29, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration explorer bar of the augmented browser is displayed as a

Art Unit: 2179

window that includes a members pane, which lists current collaborating members, and a discussions pane, which lists discussion chains in a collaboration permitting a collaboration member to post and respond to discussions or create new discussion threads (Figure 2, elements 43, 45 and 47; Column 8, lines 48-67; Column 9, lines 1-60).

Regarding claim 30, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration tool bar and the collaboration explorer bar are registered in an operating system (OS) registry (Figure 2, it is inherent that these features are registered in an operating system or else they would be inoperable.

Regarding claim 31, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein communication between the collaboration toolbar, the collaboration explorer bar and the context manager are facilitated by a Java Script communication medium (Column 17, lines 18-22).

Regarding claim 32, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration server component includes a security module that identifies users and classifies those users as various role players in the system (Column 5, lines 40-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11, 14-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inala et al. (USPN 6,442,590) in view of Lee et al. (USPN 7,133,895).

Regarding claim 1, Inala disclosed a method for collaborative Web browsing, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2179

defining collaboration spaces which comprise collaboration members and discussion chains (Figure 2; elements 43, 45 and 47; Column 8, lines 58-67; Column 9, lines 1-60);

associating collaboration spaces with one or more Web documents, topics and meta data (Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6; Column 14, lines 58-64);

defining a collaboration toolbar and displaying the collaboration toolbar on a user interface (UI), the collaboration toolbar including user UI components to list related collaboration spaces, and list related links (Figure 2; Column 8, line 62 to Column 9, line 6; Column 10, lines 50-57);

defining a collaboration co-browser which is displayed on the UI (Figure 2, item 38; Column 8, lines 17-18);

monitoring a user's browsing activity (Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52); and

mining browsed content, URL (Universal Resource Locator) and meta data to determine related collaboration spaces (Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 9, lines 49-61).

Inala does not specifically disclose the collaboration toolbar including user UI components to logon/logoff, manage collaboration spaces. However, Lee disclosed the above limitation (Figure 2, 3, and 15; Column 8, lines 25-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Inala's system by incorporating the teachings of Lee for the purpose of allowing a user

Art Unit: 2179

to efficiently control their participation in collaboration sessions (Column 8 lines 29-30 and 33-41).

Regarding claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed further comprising the step of populating the collaboration toolbar with appropriately related collaboration elements (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein upon user selection of an appropriately related collaboration space from the toolbar, further comprising the step of rendering by the collaboration co-browser a collaboration space related to the content, URL and meta data of a loaded Web page (Figure 2; Column 9, lines 49-61, where "other chat sessions" are related collaboration spaces).

Regarding claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed the step of allowing a user to instantiate collaboration operations from the collaboration co-browser (Figure 2, item 41 "control panel"; Column 8, line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed the step of augmenting by the collaboration co-browser a Web browser and displaying collaboration elements of an appropriate collaboration space corresponding to the

Art Unit: 2179

user's monitored browsing activity (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 11, Inala disclosed a system for collaborative Web browsing, comprising:

means for associating collaboration spaces with one or more Web documents, topics and meta data (Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6; Column 14, lines 58-64);

means for defining collaboration spaces which comprise collaboration members and discussion chains (Figure 2: elements 43, 45 and 47; Column 8, lines 58-67; Column 9, lines 1-60)

a collaboration toolbar component which generates a collaboration toolbar display on a user interface (UI), the collaboration toolbar including a list box of related collaboration spaces, and a list box of related links (Figure 2; Column 8, line 62 to Column 9, line 6; Column 10, lines 50-57);

a collaboration co-browser component which generates a collaboration co-browser display on the UI when a user logons on (Figure 2, item 38; Column 8, lines 17-18);

a monitor that observes a user's browsing activity, the collaboration co-browser component responding to the monitor and displaying collaboration elements of an appropriate collaboration space (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6); and

Art Unit: 2179

a mining component to mine the monitored browser content, URL (Universal Resource Locator), and meta data to determine related collaboration spaces (Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 9, lines 49-61).

Inala did not specifically disclose a user logon/logoff toggle button, buttons to manage and configure collaboration spaces. However Lee disclosed the above limitation (Figure 2, 3, and 15; Column 8, lines 25-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Inala's system by incorporating the teachings of Lee for the purpose of allowing a user to efficiently control their participation in collaboration sessions (Column 8 lines 29-30 and 33-41).

Regarding claim 14, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein upon monitoring the browsing activity by the monitor, the mining plug-in component mines the browsed content to determine an appropriate set of related collaboration elements of an appropriately related collaboration space to the browsed content (Column 9, lines 49-61, where "other chat sessions" are related collaboration spaces).

Regarding claim 15, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein upon mining the browsed content by the mining component, the monitored browsing activity populates the collaboration toolbar component with appropriately related collaboration elements (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52

and line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 16, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration co-browser component renders a collaboration space related to browser context (Figure 2, item 38).

Regarding claim 17, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein collaboration operations are instantiated from the collaboration co-browser (Figure 2, item 41 "control panel"; Column 8, line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 18, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein collaboration operations include sending email, instant messaging, creating new discussion threads, and posting and responding to discussions (Figure 2, element 47).

Regarding claim 19, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed means for populating the collaboration toolbar with appropriately related collaboration elements (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 8, lines 49-52 and line 62 to Column 9, line 6).

Regarding claim 21, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration co-browser is responsive to a selection of an appropriately related collaboration space from the toolbar for rendering a collaboration space related

to the content, URL and meta data of a loaded Web page (Figure 2; Column 5, lines 40-51; Column 9, lines 49-61).

Regarding claim 22, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Inala disclosed wherein the collaboration co-browser renders a collaboration space related to the content, URL and meta data of a loaded Web page (Figure 2, item 38).

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Inala et al. (USPN 6,442,590).

Regarding claim 27, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further Inala does not expressly teach wherein the command buttons include a pulldown menu button which, when selected, provides a list of collaboration spaces accessible by the user based on a current context, a manage collaboration spaces button which invokes a collaboration space administrative console through which new collaboration spaces can be created and existing collaboration spaces edited, and a recommended URL list pulldown menu button which, when selected, provides a list of recommended URLs that are relevant to a current collaboration context. However, this limitation would have been obvious in view of Inala, because Inala provides available and related collaboration spaces (Column 9, lines 49-61, "other active chat session") and allows control of collaboration spaces through a control panel which may also be a menu bar (Column 8, line 61 to Column 9, line 6).

9. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inala et al. (USPN 6,442,590) in view of Lee et al. (USPN 7,133,895).

Regarding claim 28, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and further Inala does not specifically disclose wherein the command buttons include a logon/logoff toggle button used for logging onto and logging off from a collaboration space server. However, Lee disclosed the above limitation (Figure 2, 3, and 15; Column 8, lines 25-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Inala's system by incorporating the teachings of Lee for the purpose of allowing a user to efficiently control their participation in collaboration sessions (Column 8 lines 29-30 and 33-41).

Response to Arguments

Applicant is reminded that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

10. Applicant's arguments filed 9/14/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 23 to 26 and 29 to 32

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,590 to Inala et al, Claims 1, 3 to 8, 10, 11, and 14 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,590 to Inala et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,895 to Lee et al. Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,590 to Inala et al, and Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,590 to Inala et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,895 to Lee et al. have been considered but are not persuasive.

11. Applicant's arguments are directed to the limitation of CollabSpaces, which has not been claimed. CollabSpaces in parenthesis is not interpreted as the limitation collaboration space. Also, CollabSpace appears to be a trade name and should not be used in the claims.

12. In response to applicant's argument that combining the context-finding mechanism of Inala et al. with the accessing mechanism of Lee et al. would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim-Lynn Dam whose telephone number is (571) 270-1408. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-5:30, every other Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kim-Lynn Dam

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER